UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,541	11/02/2001	Victor Lu	3561-102	6064

20575 7590 09/01/2005

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
SERRAO, RANODHI N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2141	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/053,541	LU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 16 August 2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-12 under Title 35, U.S. Code have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of different interpretation of the previously applied references. (See below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-3, and 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,240 to Pogue et al. ("Pog") and U.S. Patent No. 6,081,788 to Appleman et al. ("Apple").

4. As per claim 1, Pog teaches a method for tracking and reporting traffic activity on a web site (see Pog, col. 1, lines 5-8) comprising the steps of: storing a web page on a first server coupled to a wide area network (see Pog, col. 1, lines 21-32), said web page having web page code and a cookie processing script (see Pog, col. 6, lines 46-50); uploading the web page to a visitor computer responsive to a request over the wide area network from the visitor computer (see Pog, col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 15); and operating the cookie processing script on the web browsing data to obtain new cookie values; and storing the new cookie on the visitor computer including the new cookie values (see Pog, col. 7, lines 11-22). But fails to teach a method of operating the data

mining code on the visitor computer to obtain web browsing data. However, Apple teaches a method of operating the data mining code on the visitor computer to obtain web browsing data (see Apple, col. 10, line 49-col. 11, line 23).It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pog to a method of operating the data mining code on the visitor computer to obtain web browsing data in order to process pre-determined forms, formats and commands to create co-branded web pages that provide a coordinated look and feel across many web pages (see Apple, col. 3, lines 9-18).

5. As per claim 9, Pog teaches a method for analyzing activity on a web page of a web site comprising the steps of: embedding cookie processing script within the web page (see Pog, col. 6, line 52-col. 7, lines 10); sending the web page to a client node (see Pog, col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 14); operating the cookie processing script on the client node (see Pog, col. 7, lines 29-47); and returning data resulting from the operation steps (see Pog, col. 4, lines 30-60). But fails to teach a method of embedding data mining script within a web page; operating the data mining script on the client node. However, Apple teaches a method of embedding data mining script within a web page; operating the data mining script on the client node (see Apple, col. 13, lines 41-59). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pog to a method of embedding data mining script within a web page; operating the data mining script on the client node in order to process pre-determined forms, formats and commands to create co-branded web pages that provide a coordinated look and feel across many web pages (see Apple, col. 3, lines 9-18).

6. As per claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 10-12, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 1 applies fully in order to combine Pog and Apple.

7. As per claim 2, Pog and Apple teach a method, further comprising the step of receiving the new cookie values at a second server (see Pog, col. 8, lines 52-59).

8. As per claims 3 and 11, Pog and Apple teach a method, further including the steps of: attaching the new cookie values to an image request associated with a designated URL source; and sending the image request to the URL source (see Pog, col. 7, lines 11-22).

9. As per claims 5 and 12, Pog and Apple teach a method, further including the steps of: compiling the web browsing data into a web page traffic report; and posting the report for viewing over the wide area network (see Pog, col. 4, lines 30-60).

10. As per claim 6, Pog and Apple teach a method, wherein the step of generating a new cookie includes the step of operating the cookie processing script on an old cookie associated with the web page and previously stored on the visitor computer (see Pog, col. 7, lines 11-22).

11. As per claim 7, Pog and Apple teach a method, further including the step of overwriting the old cookie with the new cookie (see Pog, col. 7, lines 11-22).

12. As per claim 8, Pog and Apple teach a method, further including the steps of: detecting that an old cookie exists on the visitor computer associated with the web site; tracking events on the visitor computer; processing the old cookie using cookie processing code in view of the tracked events to obtain new cookie values; and

replacing the old cookie values with the new cookie values (see Pog, col. 6, line 52-col. 7, line 22).

13. As per claim 10, Pog and Apple teach a method, wherein the step of operating the cookie processing script on the client node includes: reading a cookie value from the client node (see Pog, column 6, line 52-column 7, line 10); tracking events on the client node (see Pog, column 7, lines 29-47); processing cookie value based on the tracked events to obtain a new cookie value; and writing a new cookie value to the client node (see Pog, column 7, lines 11-22).

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pog and Apple as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Shrader et al. (6,374,359). Pog and Apple teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1-3 above but fail to teach a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data. However, Shrader et al. teaches a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data (see Shrader et al., col. 2, lines 45-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pog and Apple to a method, further including the step of decoding the new cookie values to obtain the web browsing data in order to provide an architecture for the dynamic use and validation of HTTP cookies for authentication by an application running on a web server (see Shrader et al., col. 1, lines 62-65).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER